

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 22, 2010. In that Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, and 21-32 were rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 1, 21, and 26 are currently being amended while claims 4, 7, 9-20, 24-25, 27, and 30-32 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 21-23, 26, and 28-29 remain pending in the application.

§ 103 Rejections**Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 21-23, and 27-29**

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 21-23, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odinak et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143645; referred to herein as Odinak ‘645) in view of Odinak et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141547; referred to herein as Odinak ‘547). Claim 27 has been cancelled so the rejection of that claim is now moot. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

The combination of Odinak ‘645 and Odinak ‘547 is missing elements of Applicant’s amended claims. More specifically, the combination of Odinak ‘645 and Odinak ‘547 does not teach or otherwise suggest Applicant’s steps of “extracting a computer-readable command from the digital signal” and “executing the extracted computer-readable command at the call center node” recited, *inter alia*, in claim 1. For instance, the Office Action points to a section of Odinak ‘645 in which “the telematic control unit 26 digitizes the received words and delivers them to main system 22 for voice processing.”¹ Here, Odinak teaches processing a voice keyword yet nothing in this section of Odinak ‘645 discloses/suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that the keyword includes a computer-readable command, nor does it provide any reason or motivation to do so. Similarly, Odinak ‘547 calls for matching “digital voice information with corresponding digital data entries in the server database, which in turn are associated with a program instructional language.”² In this case, Odinak ‘547 does not teach, or

¹ Odinak et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143645, paragraph [0027].

² Odinak et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141547, paragraph [0025].

otherwise suggest, that the voice information includes a computer-readable command. Rather, the voice information and program instructional language taught in Odinak '547 are associated during an intermediate step. In particular, the digital data entries that correspond to the voice information and that are also associated to program instructional language are used in the intermediate step to link the voice information and the program. Thus, Odinak '547 clearly does not include in the transmitted digital voice information a computer-readable command that is extracted and executed at the call center node. Thus, rather than requiring a lookup or matching as taught by Odinak '547, the invention of claim 1 actually includes a computer-readable command in the digital signal sent from the telematics unit such that it is extracted and executed at the call center, as recited in the above-quoted portions of claim 1.

Amended claim 21 is also distinguishable over the Odinak '645 and Odinak '547. For instance, claim 21 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "compressing the digital signal at a particular compression ratio" and "compressing the at least one response at a compression ratio less than the particular compression ratio." This means that the digital signal is sent from the telematics unit to a remote computer-end recipient at a higher compression ratio than the response. Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in the cited sections of Odinak '645 or Odinak '547 relied upon in the Office Action that would render obvious Applicant's claims.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1 and 21. Since claims 2-3, 5-6, 8, 22-23, 26, 28-29, and 32 ultimately depend from claims 1 and 21 these claims should also be allowed therewith.

Claims 24-26 and 30-32

Claims 24-26 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odinak '645 in view of Odinak '547 and further in view of Endo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,182,989). Claims 24-25 and 30-32 have been cancelled so the rejection of those claims is moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 26 for the reasons discussed below.

Endo is missing elements of Applicant's claim and fails to make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Odinak '645 and Odinak '547. Applicant notes that Endo has been cited as teaching signal compression.³ Specifically, Endo has been cited in the Office Action as disclosing "the step of compressing the digital signal prior to the transmitting step to reduce the amount of data transmitted in the data packets from the vehicle to the computer-end recipient."⁴ While Endo includes some limited teaching of signal compression, Endo does not teach or otherwise suggest a "digital signal [that] is compressed with a compression ratio at least twice the compression ratio used to compress the at least one response" as recited in dependent claim 26. Or in other words, Endo would not reasonably be interpreted to teach compressing the digital signal and the response at different compression ratios. With regard to claim 26, the Office Action relies on a section of Endo which states that "the base station transmits a compressed message 21 to the antenna 118."⁵ It also relies on a section of Endo that references FIG. 4 and states that "the inquiry of the vehicle driver 126 is converted into an electrical audio signal which is compressed at a predetermined rate with respect to time to be radiated from the UHF antenna 118."⁶ After receiving the radiated signal, Endo teaches feeding it to a receiver 138' where it is "read from the receiver 138' at a speed slower than it is written, so that the electrical signal before the compression can be obtained." Nothing disclosed in these sections of Endo can reasonably be viewed as teaching or suggesting two different compression ratios for data sent in different directions, as claimed. As a result, the combination of the Odinak references and Endo does not render the subject matter of Applicant's claims obvious.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above rejections. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if doing so would advance prosecution of this case.

³ Non-final Office Action, January 22, 2010, page 7-page 8.

⁴ Non-final Office Action, January 22, 2010, page 7, lines 9-11.

⁵ Non-final Office Action, January 22, 2010, page 8, line 4; Endo et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,182,989, col. 9, lines 8-10.

⁶ Non-final Office Action, January 22, 2010, page 7, lines 9-11; See Endo et al., col. 18, lines 49-59.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0960 for any required fees or to credit that same deposit account with any overpayment associated with this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

REISING ETHINGTON P.C.

/E. Colin Cicotte/

Date: April 22, 2010
JDS/ECC

E. Colin Cicotte
Registration No. 63,450
P.O. Box 4390
Troy, Michigan 48099
(248) 689-3500